UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,657	01/08/2002	Timothy E. Bennett	088305-0141	8992

7590   10/20/2005

William T. Ellis
Foley & Lardner
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5143

EXAMINER
WASEL, MOHAMED A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/8/2002*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to application filed on January 8, 2002. Claims 1-15 are

presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carter (US

Patent No. 5,878,419).

2.   As per claim 1, Carter teaches a computer implemented method of automatically

generating Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) documents or messages using an EDI system,

comprising:

extracting segments, transaction sets, functional groups, and attributes from an EDI

document, as extracted data (*col. 2 lines 62-67, col.3 lines 18-29, col. 6 lines 40-60, col. 12 lines*

60-67); and

storing the extracted data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether the

extracted data is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data (*col.3*

lines 18-67, col. 4 lines 21-34, col. 4 lines 1-34, col.5 lines 3-13).

3.   As per claim 2, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one segment from the EDI document from the memory based on a

hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the

memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col. 6 lines 40-52, col. 8 lines 55-60*).

4.   As per claim 3, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one transaction set from the EDI document from the memory based on

a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the

memory (*col.1 lines 33-41, col. 2 lines 7-18, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

5.   As per claim 4, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one functional group from the EDI document from the memory based

on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in

the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

6.   As per claim 5, Carter teaches the method further comprising:

extracting at least one functional group from the EDI document from the memory based

on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in

the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*); and

extracting at least one transaction set from the EDI document that is a part of the at least

one functional group, based on a linkage in the memory of the at least one transaction set to the

at least one functional group (*col.6 lines 53-67, col. 7 lines 1-6*).

7.   As per claim 6, Carter teaches a system for automatically generating data in a self

describing markup language (*col. 17 lines 29-40*) format from received EDI data, comprising:

a data extractor that is configured to extract segments, transaction sets, functional groups,

and attributes from an EDI document, as extracted data (*col. 2 lines 62-67, col.3 lines 18-29, col.

6 lines 40-60, col. 12 lines 60-67*); and

a memory that is configured to store the extracted data in a hierarchical manner, the

extracted data being stored in the memory according to whether the extracted data is segment

data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data (*col.3 lines 18-67, col. 4 lines

21-34, col. 4 lines 1-34, col.5 lines 3-13*).

8.   As per claim 7, Carter teaches the system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one segment from the EDI document from

the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI

document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col. 6 lines 40-52, col. 8 lines 55-60*).

9.   As per claim 8, Carter teaches the system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one transaction set from the EDI document

from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the

EDI document stored in the memory (*col.1 lines 33-41, col. 2 lines 7-18, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

10.   As per claim 9, Carter teaches a system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one functional group from the EDI

document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other

data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines

35-60*).

11.   As per claim 10, Carter teaches the system further comprising:

a second data extractor that extracts at least one functional group from the EDI

document from the memory based on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other

data of the EDI document stored in the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines

35-60*); and

a third data extractor that extracts at least one transaction set from the EDI document

that is a part of the at least one functional group, based on a linkage in the memory of the at least

one transaction set to the at least one functional group (*col.6 lines 53-67, col. 7 lines 1-6*).

12.   As per claim 11, Carter teaches a computer readable data storage medium for an EDI

system having program code recorded thereon that is executable by a computer to perform the

following steps:

extracting segments, transaction sets, functional groups, and attributes from an EDI

document, as extracted data (*col. 2 lines 62-67, col.3 lines 18-29, col. 6 lines 40-60, col. 12 lines*

60-67); and

storing the extracted data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether

the extracted data is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data

(*col.3 lines 18-67, col. 4 lines 21-34, col. 4 lines 1-34, col.5 lines 3-13*).

13.   As per claim 12, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having

program code recorded thereon according to claim 11, further comprising:

extracting at least one segment from the EDI document from the memory based on a

hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDI document stored in the

memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col. 6 lines 40-52, col. 8 lines 55-60*).

14.   As per claim 13, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having

program code recorded thereon further comprising:

extracting at least one transaction set from the EDT document from the memory based on

a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDT document stored in

the memory (*col.1 lines 33-41, col. 2 lines 7-18, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

15.   As per claim 14, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having

program code recorded thereon comprising:

extracting at least one functional group from the ED1 document from the memory based

on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDT document stored in

the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*).

16.   As per claim 15, Carter teaches the computer readable data storage medium having

program code recorded thereon further comprising:

extracting at least one functional group from the EDT document from the memory based

on a hierarchical relationship between the segment and other data of the EDT document stored in

the memory (*col.2 lines 7-18, col.6 lines 53-60, col. 8 lines 35-60*); and

extracting at least one transaction set from the EDT document that is a part of the at least

one functional group, based on a linkage in the memory of the at least one transaction set to the

at least one functional group (*col.6 lines 53-67, col. 7 lines 1-6*).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

a.   Pasetes, Jr. et al (US Patent No. 5,202,977)

b.   Stephen Carter (US Patent No. 5,878,419)

c.   Sharma et al (US Patent No. 6,175,837)

d.   Ng et al (US Patent No. 6,374,256)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Wasel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MW
September 27, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100